

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected claims 1-19, 21-28, 31, 32, 34, 35 under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated by Maturi et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,559,999.

Maturi et al. teach a slightly modified technique for the traditional synchronization of the video and audio of audio-visual material. Maturi et al. include a system time clock (STC) located and provided in the decoder, a system clock reference (SCR) or program clock reference (PCR) provided by the encoder. Along with the time clocks, Maturi et al. teach a presentation time stamp which indicates the proper time for presentation of the video. Also with the time clocks, Maturi et al. teach a decoding time stamp (DTS) which indicates the proper time for decoding of the video.

Maturi et al. at column 7, lines 28-40, teach that the microcontroller 18 in response to a second interrupt, uses the System Time Clock (STC) counter 38, the presentation time stamp (PTS), and the decoding time stamp (DTS), to make adjustments to the synchronization of the video. The Examiner suggests that a sample moment of a system time associated with the sample application time moment may be a decoding time stamp (DTS).

Claim 1 has been amended to patentably distinguish over Maturi et al. by claiming that a sample moment of a system time associated with the sample application time moment that is based, at least in part, upon a delay in a packetization process. For example, such a sample moment of a system time may be an ACR, as described in the applicant's specification.

The decoding time stamp (DTS) taught by Maturi et al. is not based upon a delay in the packetization process but rather is related to the desired decoding time.

Claim 1 has further been amended to patentably distinguish over Maturi et al. by claiming that the event is apart from reconstructing video and audio. This clarifies that the event is not merely the traditional synchronization and presentation of video packets, video, audio, and audio packets.

In contrast, Maturi et al. only describes the synchronization and presentation of audio and video packets.

Accordingly claim 1, as amended, patentably distinguishes over Maturi et al.

The Examiner asserts that Maturi et al. teach that the initiation of an event is a function of STC (claimed current moment of a system time), a PTS (claimed sampled application time moment), and a DTS which is associated with a sampled moment of a system time associated with sample application time moment.

Claim 2, as amended, patentably distinguishes over Maturi et al. by claiming generating a reconstructed application time including an application time moment that is a function of a current moment of a system time, a sample application time moment, and a sample moment of a system time associated with said sample application time moment that is based, at least in part, upon a delay in a packetization process.

Maturi et al. does not suggest, nor teach, that the DTS is based, at least in part, upon a delay in a packetization process. In contrast, the DTS is based upon an anticipated time to decode the packet so that the video may be presented at the appropriate time, such as the PTS value.

Claims 3-5 depend from claims 2, and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for claim 2.

The Examiner asserts that Maturi et al. teach associating a presentation time stamp (PTS) (sample application time moment) with a system clock reference (SCR) or a program clock reference (PCR) (sample system time moment). The Examiner further suggest that Maturi et al. teach using the PTS and SCR/PCR to synchronize the reconstructed local clock (i.e., system time clock (STC)).

Claim 6, as amended, patentably distinguishes over Maturi et al. by claiming associating a sample application time moment with a sample system time moment that is based upon a delay in a packetization process.

The Examiner suggests that the sample system time moment is the SCR/PCR (or potentially the DTS). The sample system time moment has been amended to clarify that it is based upon a delay in a packetization process. In contrast, the PTS is based upon the presentation of the packet so that the video may be presented at the appropriate time.

Claims 7-11 depend from claims 6, and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for claim 6.

Claim 12, as amended, patentably distinguishes over Maturi et al. by claiming incorporating a sample application time moment in a first data unit to be presented at a first data unit presentation moment of a system time that is based, at least in part, upon a delay in a packetization process.

Claims 13-17 depend from claims 12, and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for claim 12.

Claim 18, as amended, patentably distinguishes over Maturi et al. by claiming instigating the event apart from reconstructing video and audio at a moment of the reconstructed application time corresponding to the correlating moment.

Maturi et al. fails to disclose such a limitation, as previously discussed.

Claims 19-26 depend from claims 18, and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for claim 18.

Claim 27, as amended, patentably distinguishes over Maturi et al. by claiming incorporating the reference moment in a data access unit having a data access unit having a data access unit presentation moment of the system time that is based upon a delay, at least in part, upon a packetization process.

Claim 28, as amended, patentably distinguishes over Maturi et al. by claiming a packet generator to incorporate the reference moment in a data access unit having a data access unit presentation moment of the system time that is based upon a delay, at least in part, upon a packetization process.

Claim 31, as amended, patentably distinguishes over Maturi et al. by claiming an event apart from reconstructing video and audio.

Claims 32 and 33 depend from claim 31 and are patentable for the same reasons asserted for claim 31.

Claim 34, as amended, patentably distinguishes over Maturi et al. by claiming an event apart from reconstructing video and audio.

Claim 35, as amended, patentably distinguishes over Maturi et al. by claiming an event apart from reconstructing video and audio.

Accordingly, claims 1-28 and 31-35 (claims 29 and 30 have been canceled, without prejudice) should not be in a form suitable for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,




Kevin L. Russell
Reg. No. 38,292
Of Attorneys for Applicant
Telephone: (503) 227-5631

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail postage prepaid in an envelope addressed to: MAIL STOP Patent Application, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on April __ 2004.

Dated: April 2nd 2004


Kevin L. Russell